



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1460
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/690,883	10/22/2003	James A. Fisher	TUC920030096US1	6818

46244 7590 03/22/2007
LAW OFFICE OF CHARLES W. PETERSON, JR. TUCSON
11703 BOWMAN GREEN DR
suite 100
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

PHAM, MICHAEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2167

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/690,883	Applicant(s) FISHER ET AL.	
	Examiner Michael D. Pham	Art Unit 2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 January 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10/22/03 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because they fail to show necessary textual labels of features or symbols in figure 2 and 5 as described in the specifications. For example, placing labels next to element numbers such as “page pointer table” for figure 3 element 162 would give the viewer necessary detail to fully understand the drawing at a glance. A descriptive textual label for each numbered element in these figures would be needed to fully and better understand these figures without substantial analysis of the detailed specification. Any structural detail that is of sufficient importance to be described should be shown in the drawing. Optionally, applicant may wish to include a table next to the present figure to fulfill this requirement. See 37 CFR 1.83 37 CFR 1.84(n)(o) is recited below:

(n) *Symbols*. Graphical drawing symbols may be used for conventional elements when appropriate. The elements for which such symbols and labeled representations are used must be adequately identified in the specification. Known devices should be illustrated by symbols which have a universally recognized conventional meaning and are generally accepted in the art. Other symbols which are not universally recognized may be used, subject to approval by the Office, if they are not likely to be confused with existing conventional symbols, and if they are readily identifiable.

(o) *Legends*. Suitable descriptive legends may be used subject to approval by the Office, or may be required by the examiner where necessary for understanding of the drawing. They should contain as few words as possible.

Specification

2. There are many claimed words used that do not provide any explicit definition such words are: a repeatable data structure, page map, tabular lists, page pointer table, etc. Further

Art Unit: 2167

because such broad terms are used to describe the specifications, it is difficult to understand the novelty in utilizing this claimed data structure.

Claim Objections

3. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: no clear definitions of a page pointer table, page map, repeatable data, a tabular list is.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. Claims 8-16 rejection under 101 are respectfully withdrawn.
6. Claims 17-19 rejection under 101 are respectfully withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2167

8. Claims 8, 11, 13, 14, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 7039658 by Starkey (hereafter Starkey). (as best as examiner is able to ascertain.)

Claim 8:

Starkey discloses the following claimed limitations:

“a data generation module generating variable data for display” [col. 3 line 1, application store];

“a collection of hypertext mark up language (HTML) template files, ones of said HTML template files including placeholders in markup text for dynamic input data” [col. 3 line 1-5 template store, each template has a name, body, and selection criteria with at least two templates having the same name. Abstract, Applications use the dynamic hierarchy to identify specific templates for use.];

a page generation module selectively providing HTML documents from said HTML template files, said page generation module combining said variable data with said placeholders in selected said ones [The application manager producing a representation of a web page in response to the body of each selected template that the interface converts into a form that is compatible with the user's web browser.]; and

each of said data generation module and said page generation module including a page pointer table with a single entry for each of said HTML template files [col. 13 lines 53-56 a hash table includes a slot that points to the template object for the DrlTable. (i.e. page pointer table points to a template)], **each said single entry for each of said ones pointing to a corresponding repeatable data structure** [Col. 7 lines 45-46 templates are repeatable data

Art Unit: 2167

structures.] and **“a page map for tabular data lists in said corresponding repeatable data structure, said tabular data lists being displayed as a table on a generated said HTML document”** [Col. 7 lines 64-67, templates (repeatable structure) have names (i.e. page map) that further uses criteria by defining a particular table (i.e. tabular data list being displayed as table on a generated html document.)].

Claim 11:

A collaborative design system as in claim 8, wherein at least one said page map includes a plurality of entries, each of said plurality of entries pointing to a corresponding one of said tabular data lists [Col. 7 lines 64-67, templates have names (i.e. corresponding map) that further use criteria by defining a particular table (i.e. points to one or more corresponding tabular lists).].

Claim 13:

A collaborative design system as in claim 8, wherein design responsibility for each of said data generation module, said page generation module and said HTML template files is assignable to a different design group [Figure 1, Application server (page generator), Applicatoins (data generation module), Template manager (html template files), are different design groups.].

Claim 14:

A system having a web-based management interface providing selection amongst a plurality of web pages selectable for display, said web-based management interface comprising:

a data generation module generating variable data for display [Col. 6 lines 34-36, the invention contains modules that facilitates web page development and generation of responses that will produce a web page image at a browser.];

a hypertext mark up language (HTML) template file collection, ones of said HTML template files including placeholders in markup text for dynamic input data [Col. 1 lines 60-64, template files contains locations for code that controls web page semantics];

a page generation module selectively providing HTML documents from said HTML template files, said page generation module combining said variable data with said placeholders in selected said ones [Col. 1 lines 54-64, active page server processes the combination of template and code to produce the html documents.]; and

each of said data generation module and said page generation module including a page pointer table with a single entry for each of said HTML template files [col. 13 lines 53-56 a hash table includes a slot that points to the template object for the DrlTable. (i.e. page pointer table points to a template)], **each said single entry for each of said ones pointing to a corresponding repeatable data structure** [Col. 7 lines 45-46 templates are repeatable data structures linked to web pages] **and a page map for tabular data lists in said corresponding repeatable data structure, said tabular data lists being displayed as a table on a generated said HTML document** [Col. 7 lines 64-67, templates have names (i.e. corresponding map) that

further use criteria by defining a particular table (i.e. points to one or more corresponding tabular lists).].

Claim 17:

A program product for managing a system, said computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code thereon, said computer readable program code comprising:

computer readable program code means for generating variable data for display [Col. 6 lines 34-36, the invention contains modules that facilitates web page development and generation of responses that will produce a web page image at a browser.] **and storing generated said variable data according to a page pointer table, said page pointer table having a single entry for each of a plurality of hypertext mark up language (HTML) files** [Col. 5 lines 30-36, web pages stored on application server. On Col. 5 lines 48-50, application server contains a relational data management structure that contains data tables to store and link the information. That is there exists a table with an entry for each of html template files.], **each said single entry pointing to a corresponding repeatable data structure** col. 13 lines 53-56 a hash table includes a slot that points to the template object for the DrlTable. (i.e. page pointer table points to a template)] **and a page map for tabular data lists in said corresponding repeatable data structure, said tabular data lists listing said generated data** [Col. 7 lines 64-67, templates have names (i.e. corresponding map) that further use criteria by defining a particular table (i.e. points to one or more corresponding tabular lists).];

computer readable program code means for defining said plurality of HTML files
[Col. 2 lines 66-67 to col. 3 lines 1-19, defines template files with name, body, and selection criteria.]; and

computer readable program code means for selectively generating HTML documents from defined said HTML files and stored said variable data [Col. 1 lines 54-64, active page server processes the combination of template and code to produce the html documents.].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 9-10, 12, 15-16, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 7039658 by Starkey (hereafter Starkey) as applied to claims 1-3, 8, 11, 13, 14, and 17 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0138509 by Burrows et. al. (hereafter Burrows).

Claim 9:

Starkey does not explicitly ¹disclose **wherein adding HTML template files increases the size of each of said data generation module and said page generation module only by the length of a corresponding said single entry for each said added HTML template file.**

On the other hand, Burrows, 0004, discloses that that if the number of web pages in the network is large, the amount of memory required to store the url's and links in the web database will be correspondingly large. Further disclosing 0041 there is the ability to put a limit on the length of reference chains for decompressing a row.

Both inventions are directed towards web databases. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Starkley to have included the step of adding HTML template files increases the size of each of said data generation module and said page generation module only by the length of a corresponding said single entry for each said added HTML template file based on the disclosure of Burrows. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so for the purpose of storing the web pages. By providing more web pages it provides more options for manipulation.

Claim 10:

Starkey does not explicitly disclose **wherein each said single entry further includes a number indicating the length of said page map.** On the other hand, Burrows, 0041, discloses putting a

¹ Obviously adding more templates increases size.

limit on length of reference chains in a page link structure. If there is a limit there must be some indication of what the length must be in order to reach the limit.

Both inventions are directed towards web databases. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have modified Starkey to have included the step wherein each said single entry further includes a number indicating the length of said page map based on the disclosure of Burrow. A skilled would have been motivated to do so for the purpose of facilitating row decompression. Allowing memory to be saved.

Claim 12:

Starkey does not explicitly disclose wherein each entry in said plurality of entries includes an offset from a first listed data element and a number of listed data elements in said corresponding one.

On the other hand, Burrows, 0065, discloses an offset for a corresponding row. Further disclosing that the offset is used to facilitate link database compression.

Both inventions are directed towards web databases. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have modified Starkey to have included wherein each entry in said plurality of entries includes an offset from a first listed data element and a number of listed data elements in said corresponding one based on the disclosure of Burrows. A skilled would have been motivated to do so for the purpose of facilitating link database compression.

Claim 15:

Starkey does not explicitly disclose **wherein each said single entry further includes a number indicating the length of said page map**. On the other hand, Burrows, 0041, discloses putting a limit on length of reference chains in a page link structure. If there is a limit there must be some indication of what the length must be in order to reach the limit.

Both inventions are directed towards web databases. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have modified Starkey to have included the step wherein each said single entry further includes a number indicating the length of said page map based on the disclosure of Burrow. A skilled would have been motivated to do so for the purpose of facilitating row decompression. Allowing memory to be saved.

Claim 16:

Starkey discloses **wherein at least one said page map includes a plurality of entries, each of said plurality of entries pointing to a corresponding one of said tabular data lists** [Col. 7 lines 64-67, templates have names (i.e. corresponding map) that further use criteria by defining a particular table (i.e. points to one or more corresponding tabular lists).]. However Starkey does not explicitly disclose wherein **each of said plurality of entries includes an offset from a first listed data element and a number of listed data elements in said corresponding one**.

Art Unit: 2167

On the other hand, Burrows, 0065, discloses an offset for a corresponding row. Further disclosing that the offset is used to facilitate link database compression.

Both inventions are directed towards web databases. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have modified Starkey to have included wherein each entry in said plurality of entries includes an offset from a first listed data element and a number of listed data elements in said corresponding one based on the disclosure of Burrows. A skilled would have been motivated to do so for the purpose of facilitating link database compression.

Claim 18:

Starkey does not explicitly disclose **wherein each said single entry further indicates the length of said page map.**

On the other hand Burrow, 0041, discloses for that there is the ability to put a limit on the length of reference chains for decompressing a row. If there is a limit there must be some indication of what the length must be in order to reach the limit.

Both inventions are directed towards web databases. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have modified Starkey to have included wherein each entry in said plurality of entries includes an offset from a first listed data element and a plurality of listed data elements in said corresponding one based on the disclosure of Burrows. A skilled would have been

motivated to do so for the purpose of facilitating row decompression. Allowing memory to be saved.

Claim 19:

Starkey does not explicitly disclose **wherein each entry in each said page map includes an offset pointing to a corresponding one of said tabular data lists and a number of listed data elements in said corresponding one.**

On the other hand, Burrows, 0065, discloses an offset for a corresponding row. Further disclosing that the offset is used to facilitate link database compression.

Both inventions are directed towards web databases. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have modified Starkey to have included wherein each entry in said plurality of entries includes an offset from a first listed data element and a number of listed data elements in said corresponding one based on the disclosure of Burrows. A skilled would have been motivated to do so for the purpose of facilitating link database compression.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 8-19 in the reply filed on 1/3/07 is acknowledged.

12. Applicant's arguments filed 8/21/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's assert the following directed towards claim 8-19.

A. Page 13, That "the collection of hypertext markup language (html) template files, ones of said html template files including placeholders in markup text for dynamic input data" and also discloses "each said single entry for each of said ones pointing to a corresponding repeatable data structure. So, the assertion is that the templates are both templates and point to a corresponding template. That is neither what is recited in claims 8 and 14.

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees with applicants. Regarding claim 8 and 14, towards the limitation "a collection of hypertext mark up language (HTML) template files" [col. 3 lines 1-5, template stores]. As to "ones of said html template files including placeholders in markup text for dynamic input data" [col. 3 lines 1-5, each template has a name, body, and selection criteria with at least two templates having the same name. Abstract, Applications use the dynamic hierarchy to identify specific templates for use.] One of ordinary skill in the art would obviously know that template files are essentially just the skeletons of a webpage and hence has placeholders to insert data. Placeholders for dynamic data is also not new to the art (see patent application 20030177175).

B. Page 14, That "the recitation of a "page pointer table with a single entry for each of the html template files" the Office action relies upon Starkey "Col. 5 lines 30-36, web pages stored on application server. On Col. 5 lines 48-50, application server contains a relational data

management structure that contains data tables to store and link the information” That however the Office action provides further explanation “that is there exists a table with an entry for each of html template files”. However it’s asserted by applicants that “an entry in a relational database, which maintains a relationship between data (data, not templates) is far from a pointer to which each file in the table much less a “page pointer table with a single entry for each of said HTML template files”.

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant’s that a “page pointer table with a single entry for each of the html template files” is not taught by Starkey. Starkey discloses that a hash table is able to store a pointer to a template file. Hence suggesting a “page pointer table with a single entry for each of the html template files”.

C. Page 14, “a page map for tabular data lists in said corresponding repeatable data structure, said tabular data lists being displayed as a table on a generated said HTML document”, office action relies on Starkey, however, a template name, especially when templates have the same name, is not a map to anything. Therefore, Starkey fails to teach the present invention as recited in claims 8 and 14.

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees with applicants that starkey does not suggest “a page map for tabular lists in said corresponding repeatable data structure, said tabular data lists being displayed as a table on a generated said html document”. Starkey discloses Col. 7 lines 64-67, templates (repeatable structure) have names (i.e. page map) that further uses

criteria (a, b, c) by defining a particular table (i.e. tabular data list being displayed as table on a generated html document.). Therefore because there is a way to distinguish which template, of course there is a map. This is similar to locating Springfield, Illinois, versus locating Springfield, Virginia. Because there is a way to distinguish the two, there must be a way to find it.

D. Page 14-15, So it is being asserted that the starkey web page image responses are the recited generated variable data. However, it is asserted that the recitation of claim 17 of storing generated said variable data according to a page pointer table, said page pointer table having a single entry for each of a plurality of hypertext markup language (HTML) files” is taught by Starkey. However, as noted hereinabove, Starkey generates web pages and therefore, does not store them and, further, storing web pages falls far short of storing data generated for display according to a page pointer table as claim 17 recites.

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Starkey col. 5 lines 35-36 enables the ready incorporation or inheritance of prior web site developments. Hence, Starkey suggests storing web pages. Further, Starkey discloses col. 3 lines 15-20 that the application manager producing a representation of a web page in response to the body of each of the selected template that the interface converts into a form that is compatible with the user web browser. Col. 3 lines 30-35, the act of saving new templates for a given application, hence tries to store a pointer to the newly created template set object (col. 9 lines 7-8).

E. Page 15, That templates are both the templates and point to a corresponding template.
That is neither what is recited in claim 17.

In response, please see C above.

F. Page 15, that “limiting the length of reference chains for decompressing a row” and providing a length indication in a pointer table (i.e. how long each page map is) are two very different things. Therefore, the combination of burrows and starkey does not result in claim 10 and 18.

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Both pieces of data are merely data that provides length. Hence, burrows and starkey disclose the result of claims 10 and 18.

G. Page 15-16, Burrows is relied upon to show that if the number of web pages in the network is large, the amount of memory required to store the url's and links in the web database will be correspondingly large” Claims 7 and 9 are directed to the above described advantages of the present invention. That is, as opposed to bloating the modules as described in paragraph 0023 of the present invention, the “size of each of said executable modules [increases] only by the length of the corresponding said page pointer entry for each said added page”

In response, the modules are essentially programs run in memory, that still increase in size. The size of the module in memory increases with each added page. This is similar to as the number of web pages being stored increases so does the amount of memory in a database increase. Hence it appears Burrows suggests this limitation.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon, if any, is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael D. Pham whose telephone number is (571) 272-3924. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael Pham
Art Unit 2167
Examiner *M.P.*

Cam Y Truong
Art Unit 2162
Primary Examiner

Cam Y Truong